1 Hon. Benjamin J. Settle Jerry J. Moberg, WSBA #5282 2 Moberg Rathbone Kearns P.O. Box 130 3 238 W. Division Ave. Ephrata, WA 98823 (509) 754-2356 4 Attorneys for Defendants 5 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON¹ 7 L.KM., individually, and on behalf of her NO. CV: 18-5345-BJS daughter C.K.M., and J.M.; 8 **DEFENDANTS ANSWER TO** Plaintiffs, AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR 9 **DAMAGES** v. 10 BETHEL SCHOOL DISTRICT: THOMAS SIEGEL, in his individual capacity; ROBERT MAXWELL, in his individual capacity; 11 NANCY McKEEMAN, in her individual capacity; MEGAN NELSON, in her individual 12 capacity; CLIFFORD ANDERSON, in his 13 individual capacity; TOM GIFFORD, in his individual capacity; HEIDI MILLER, in her individual capacity; and JOHN/JANE DOES 1-14 5, in their individual capacities; 15 Defendants. 16 COMES NOW the Defendants, by and through its attorney of record, Jerry J. Moberg and 17 Jerry Moberg & Associates, PS, and enters this answer to Plaintiff's complaint as follows: 18 I. **PARTIES** 19 1.1. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.1 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** the 20 same. 21 22 23 ¹ The amended complaint was filed before the case was removed to this court and bears the caption of the Pierce County Superior Court. 24 16-04121-L.K.M. v Bethel School District

P.O. Box 130 | 238 W. Division Ave.

(509) 754-2356 | Fax (509) 754-4202

Ephrata, WA 98823

DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT

NO. CV: 18-5345-BJS

Page 1 of 13

- 1.2. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** the same.
- 1.3. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.3 of the Complaint Defendants **ADMIT** that it is a school district organized under the laws of Washington and authorized to do business in the State; has its primary place of business in Pierce County but **DENY** each and every allegation in this paragraph.
- 1.4. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.4 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that it had supervision and control of CKM while she was in attendance at school but DENY each and every other allegation in this paragraph.
- 1.5. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.5 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Thomas Siegel was the Superintendent of Bethel when CKM attended the Bethel School District but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.6. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.6 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Robert Maxwell was the Director of Special Services for part of the time when CKM attended the Bethel School District but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.7. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.7 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Nancy McKeeman was an employee of the District with some duties regarding Individualized Education Plans (IEP) but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.8. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.8 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Megan Nelson was an Education Coordinator for Bethel when CKM attended the Bethel School District but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.

- 1.9. n answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.9 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Clifford Anderson was the Principal of Bethel High School during part of the time that CKM attended the Bethel School District but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.10. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.10 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that Tom Gifford was the Vice Principal of Bethel High School during the 2012-13 school year but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.11. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.11 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that Heidi Miller was a special education teacher at Bethel High School during the 2012-13 school year but **DENY** each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 1.12. In answer to the allegations in paragraph 1.12 of the Complaint the Defendants are unable to determine the identity of the "Doe" Defendants, and therefore **DENY** each and every allegation contained in this paragraph.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2.1 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 2.1 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** the same.
- 2.2 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 2.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** that jurisdiction and venue are in Pierce County Superior Court and asset that since this case was removed to the United State District Court for the Western District of Washington venue and jurisdiction are properly before this court.
- 2.3 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 2.3 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** the same.

III. **FACTS** 1 2 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.1 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** the 3 same. 4 3.2 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the 5 same. 6 3.3 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.3 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the 7 same. 8 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.4 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the 9 same. 10 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.5 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the 11 same. 12 The complaint does not include a paragraph 3.6. 13 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.7 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that 3.7 14 DM was emergency expelled but **DENY** the remaining allegations. 15 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.8 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that 16 after his expulsion from Clover Park DM transferred to Bethel but **DENY** each and every 17 other allegation in this paragraph. 18 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.9 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that 3.9 19 around the time of DM's expulsion William Coats met with Robert Maxwell but DENY 20 each and every other allegation of this paragraph. 21 3.10 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.10 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the 22 same. 23 24 16-04121-L.K.M. v Bethel School District

16-04121-L.K.M. v Bethel School District DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT NO. CV: 18-5345-BJS Page 4 of 13



- 3.11 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.11 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 3.12 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.12 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 3.13 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.13 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 3.14 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.14 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that on enrollment with Bethel Nancy McKeeman participated in the creation of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for DM but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 3.15 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.15 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT that on enrollment with Bethel Megan Nelson participated in the creation of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for DM but DENY each and every other allegation contained in this paragraph.
- 3.16 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.16 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that DM was placed in the Special Education class at Bethel High School with Special Education teacher Heidi Miller and that CKM was also in her special education class because she had special needs **DENY** each and every other allegation in this paragraph.
- 3.17 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.17 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that Defendant Miller and the paraeducators and aides in her class maintained an observational log on DM and other students but **DENY** each and every other allegation in this paragraph.

NO. CV: 18-5345-B. Page 5 of 13

1	3.18	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.18 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
2		same.
3	3.19	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.19 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
4		same.
5	3.20	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.20 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
6		same.
7	3.21	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.21 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
8		same.
9	3.22	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.22 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
10		same.
11	3.23	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.23 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
12		same.
13	3.24	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.24 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
14		same.
15	3.25	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.25 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT the
16		same.
17	3.26	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.26 of the Complaint the Defendants DENY the
18		same.
19	3.27	In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.27 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT
20		that DM remained in Ms. Miller's classroom but DENY each and every other allegation set
21		forth in this paragraph.
22		
23		
24	16-04121-	L K M v Bethel School District

- 3.28 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.28 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that she communicated some matters regarding DM to Defendants Nelson and Defendant Gifford but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 3.29 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.29 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that DM remained in Ms. Miller's classroom but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 3.30 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.30 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 3.31 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.31 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that CKM was disciplined in October 2012 for running away from the area she was assigned to but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 3.32 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 3.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

- 4.1 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.1 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT**CKM attended school in the Bethl District and that the District has duties under the law regarding students but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 4.2 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that while attending school the District had custody of CKM and under the law has duties pertaining to students but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 4.3 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.3 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

- 4.4 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.4 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.5 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.5 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.6 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.6 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that Defendant Bethel operated the Bethel High School but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 4.7 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.7 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.8 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.8 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 1.9 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.9 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- B. VIOLATION OF WASHINGTON'S LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION (WLAD), RCW 49.60 ALL DEFENDANTS
- 4.10 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.10 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that RCW 49.60 is commonly referred to as the Washington Law Against Discrimination and RCW 49.60.030 contains language related to discrimination but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 4.11 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.11 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.12 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.12 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

4.13 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.13 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

- C. VIOLATION OF C.K.M.'S CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AND ENFORCED BY 42 U.S.C. § 1983 DEFENDANTS SIEGEL, MAXWELL, McKEEMAN, NELSON, ANDERSON, GIFFORD, MILLER AND JOHN/JANE DOES 1-5.
 - 4.14 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.14 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that the 14th Amendment Due Process Clause applies to the states and provides citizens with certain rights and protections but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
 - 4.15 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.15 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
 - 4.16 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.16 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
 - 4.17 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.17 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
 - 4.18 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.18 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
 - 4.19 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.19 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
 - 4.20 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.20 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- D. VIOLATION OF C.K.M.'S CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AND ENFORCED BY 42 U.S.C. § 1983 UNDER *MONELL*—DEFENDANT BETHEL

- 4.21 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.21 of the Complaint the Defendants **ADMIT** that Defendant Bethel has various rights and responsibilities related to its policies, customs and practices but **DENY** each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 4.22 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.22 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.23 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.23 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

E. VIOLATION OF C.K.M.'S RIGHTS UNDER TITLE IX AND SECTION 1983 THROUGH THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE– ALL DEFENDANTS

- 4.24 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.24 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.25 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.25 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.26 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.26 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.27 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.27 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.28 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.28 appears to be the Plaintiffs summary of their view of a legal principal and does not require a response.
- 4.29 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.29 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 4.30 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.30 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

4.31 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.31 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.

V. **DAMAGES**

- 5.1 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 5.1 of the Complaint the Defendants ADMIT
 Plaintiffs have brough various claims for damages but DENY each and every other allegation set forth in this paragraph.
- 5.2 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 5.2 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 5.3 In answer to the allegations in paragraph 5.3 of the Complaint the Defendants **DENY** the same.
- 5.4 Plaintiffs remaining paragraphs VI and VII of their complaint demand a jury and set forth a prayer for relief and do not require a response. To the extent a response might be required Defendants **DENY** the same.

VI. JURY DEMAND

6.1 Defendants join in Plaintiff's demand that this case be tried by a jury.

VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Defendants are not required to respond to the prayer for relief but deny that the Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief prayed for in this complaint.

BY WAY OF FURTHER ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT, AND IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, DEFENDANTS SETS FORTH THE FOLLOWING:

1. **INJURIES CAUSED BY THE INTENTIONAL ACTS OF OTHERS:** The injuries and damages alleged by the plaintiffs were the caused by the intentional acts of DM and the Defendants are not responsible under Washington law for the damages

caused by the intentional acts of others

- 2. **FAILURE TO MITIGATE:** On information and belief the defendants assert that plaintiffs have failed to mitigate their damages by failing to seek proper psychological or other professional assistance for themselves and CKM.
- 3. **FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM:** The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
- 4. **PUBLIC DUTY DOCTRINE:** Some of the duties claimed to be owed by defendant in this lawsuit are public duties owed to all and cannot be the basis for a negligence claim against the municipal defendant.
- 5. **QUALIFIED IMMUNITY:** The individually named defendants are entitled to qualified immunity from suit and are legally immune from liability in this action.
- 6. **STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS:** The Plaintiffs federal claims against the Defendants are or maybe barred by the appropriate statute of limitations.

WHEREFORE, Defendant having fully answered Plaintiffs' Complaint herein, pray that the same be dismissed with prejudice and held for naught, Defendants be awarded attorney fees, costs and disbursements herein, and for any further relief deemed just and equitable by the Court.

DATED August 31, 2021.

JERRY MOBERG & ASSOCIATES, PS

/s/ Jerry J. Moberg

Jerry J. Moberg, WSBA #5282 Attorney for Defendants

> P.O. Box 130 | 238 W. Division Ave. Ephrata, WA 98823 (509) 754-2356 | Fax (509) 754-4202

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the

CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Darrell L Cochran <u>darrell@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>adietz@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>aulmer@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>bgrotz@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>chris@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>igott@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>kevin@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>laura@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>mmcneil@pcvalaw.com</u>, <u>sawes@pcvalaw.com</u>

Thomas Brian Vertetis tom@pcvalaw.com, kwailes@pcvalaw.com

Loren A Cochran loren@cochrandouglas.com, Kim@cochrandouglas.com, cole@cochrandouglas.com, ella@cochrandouglas.com, staff@cochrandouglas.com

Nicholas B. Douglas <u>cole@cochrandouglas.com</u>, <u>ella@cochrandouglas.com</u>, <u>loren@cochrandouglas.com</u>

DATED this 31st day of August 2021.

/s/ Dawn Severin

Dawn Severin, Senior Paralegal